

Panaji, 28th November, 1996 (Agrahayana 7, 1918)

SERIES II No. 35

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

NOTE: There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 34 dated 21-11-96 as follows:—

- 1) Extraordinary dated 25-11-96 from pages 545 to 546 regarding Notifications/Order from Department of Revenue.
- 2) Extraordinary No. 2 dated 27-11-1996 from pages 547 to 548 regarding Notification from Department of Education, Art & Culture (Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education).

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Raj Bhavan

Order

No. GEST/2/42/96/2943

In continuation of Order No. GEST/1/65/2442/94 dated 26th September, 1994, the tenure of Lt. C. R. Praveen Nair (03756-K) is extended from 21-9-96 to 31st December, 1996 or till a suitable substitute is selected by His Excellency, the Governor of Goa, whichever is earlier.

The approval to this, was conveyed by the Ministry of Defence vide letter No. MF/NA/0390/92/151/2085/DO(P)/D(N-II)/96 dated 28th October, 1996 signed by Shri S. L. Bunker, Director (Coast Guard).

J. K. Dadoo, Secretary to Governor.
Panaji, 25th November, 1996.

Department of Election

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Notification

No. 5-24-91/ELEN- Vol-I

The following Order No. 76/GOA-LA/95 dated 7th June, 1996 issued by the Election Commission of India, New Delhi is hereby published for general information.

D. N. Kamble, Asstt. Chief Electoral Officer.
Panaji, 3rd July, 1996.

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Nirvachan Sadan,
Ashoka Road,
New Delhi - 110001.

7th June, 1996

Dated: 17 Jyaishta, 1918 (SAKA)

Order

No. 76/GOA-LA/95

WHEREAS, the Election Commission of India is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column 4 of the Table below

at the General Election to the Goa Legislative Assembly specified in column 2 and held from the constituency specified in column 3 against his/her name has failed to lodge the account of his/her election expenses as shown in column 5 of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice by the election Commission or after considering the representation made by them, if any, the Election Commission is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column 4 of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State or Union Territory for a period of three years from the date of this order:—

TABLE

No.	Particulars of Elections	Sr. No. & Name of the Assembly Constituency	Name & Address of the contesting candidates	Reasons for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1	General Elections to the Goa Legislative Assembly	20 - Ponda	Mulla Dashkir Mulla OPA, Khandepar, Goa	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses

By order,

BABU RAM

Secretary to the Election
Commission of India

Department of Labour

Order

No. 28/55/93-LAB-

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. D. Sadhale, Joint Secretary (Labour).

Panaji, 12th June, 1996.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Ajit J. Agni, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

No. IT/54/94

Miss Elita Ferrao,
Rep. by General Secretary,
Goa Municipal Workers Union,
St. Inez-Panaji, Goa.

— Workman/Party I

V/s

The Chief Officer,
Mapusa Municipal Council,
Mapusa, Bardez-Goa.

— Employer/Party II

Workman/ Party I - Represented by Adv. Shri C. J. Mane.

Employer/Party II - Represented by Adv. Shri Gaitonde.

Panaji, dated: 8-5-1996.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act, 14 of 1947) the Government of Goa by order dated 1-11-93 bearing No. 28/55/93-LAB; referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

- (1) "Whether the action of the Mapusa Municipal Council in terminating the services of their daily rated workman Miss Elita Ferrao w. e. f. 15-1-1988 is legal and justified?"
- (2) "Whether the demand of Miss Elita Ferrao represented through Goa Municipal Workers Union for regularisation in the post of Jr. Stenographer/typist w. e. f. 7th July, 1987 is legal and justified?"

If not, to what relief the workmen is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference a case was registered under No. IT/54/94 and registered A/D notice was issued to the parties. The Party I (for short, 'Workmen') filed the statement of claim which is at Exb. 4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the workmen are that she was appointed on daily wages as Steno-typist on 7th July, 1987 by the party II, (for short, 'Employer') and she worked till 15-1-1988. The employer terminated her services without issuing any letter of termination to her and her termination was in violation of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947. The workman was again taken in employment as Steno-typist under order dated 13-8-90 for the period from 31-7-90 to 10-8-90. The employer vide letter dated 30-8-90 addressed to the Employment Officer, Regional Employment Exchange, Panaji, invited names for the post of junior Steno-typist and asked to sponsor the names of the candidates residing in the vicinity of Mapusa. Accordingly a list of candidates was forwarded to the employer which included the name of the workman. Though the workman passed in the written as well as oral test she was denied the post and another candidate who was not fulfilling the conditions was appointed by the employer. However, subsequently the workman was appointed as junior stenographer w. e. f. 30-8-93 on probation period of 2 years. The workman contended that she was entitled for regularisation of her services from the date of her initial appointment as a Steno-typist and she should be paid arrears of salary arising out of such regularisation on the basis of equal pay for equal work.

3. The employer filed the written statement which is at Exb. 7. The employer stated that the workman was employed on daily wages and hence issuing of letter of termination of services did not arise, and that also there was no violation of the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act. The employer admitted that the workman was appointed as Jr. Steno Typist w. e. f. 30-8-93 on temporary basis, but denied that she was entitled for regularisation in service from the date of her initial appointment as Steno typist or that she was entitled to any arrears of salary. Thereafter the workman filed her rejoinder which is at Exb. 8, contraverting the pleadings made by the employer in the written statement.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed:

1. Whether party I proves that party II terminated her services w. e. f., 15-1-1988 in violation of the provisions Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947?
2. Whether party I proves that the termination of her services by party II w. e. f., 15-1-88 is illegal and unjustified?
3. Whether party I proves that her demand for regularisation in the post of Jr. Stenographer w. e. f. 7-7-87 is legal and justified?
4. Whether party I is entitled to any relief?
5. what Award?

5. My findings on the issues are as follows:

- Issue No. 1 - In the negative
Issue No. 2 - In the negative
Issue No. 3 - In the negative
Issue No. 4 - In the negative
Issue No. 5 - As per order below

REASONS

6. **ISSUE No. 1:** It is the case of the workman that she was appointed as Steno typist on 7-7-1987 and that her services were terminated orally on 15-1-1988. Adv. Shri Mane, representing the workman has submitted that the termination of the services of the workman is in violation of the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947 because the conditions laid down in Section 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947 were not complied with. He submitted that on this count the termination of the services of the workman is illegal. He has relied upon the decision of the Rajasthan High Court in the case of T. A. Benny v/s Rajasthan Co-operative Dairy Federation Ltd., reported in 1991 1 CLR 460. Adv. Shri Gaitonde representing the employer on the other hand has submitted that Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, is not applicable to the case of the workman as she was not in continuous service of one year. He has submitted that the workman was not falling within the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, and hence there was no question of violation of the provisions of the said Act, by the employer. It is no doubt true that the Rajasthan High Court in the case of T. A. Bury (Supra) has held that termination of service in violation of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947 is illegal. To find out whether there is violation of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act or not, it is necessary to analyse Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act. Sec. 25 F lays down that services of a workman who has been in continuous service for not less than one year in an industry shall not be retrenched by an employer unless the workman has been given one month's notice in writing, the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid wages, in lieu of such notice, and the workman has been paid at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent of 15 days average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months. Therefore, Sec. 25 F of the Act shall come into play only if the workman was in continuous service for not less than one year prior to the termination of his services, by way of retrenchment. As per Sec. 25 B (2)

of the I. D. Act, 1947, a workman is deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year if during a period of 12 calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, he has actually worked with the employer for not less than 240 days. Therefore unless the workman has proved that she had worked with the employer for a period of 240 days prior to the termination of her services, the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, would not be applicable to her. In the present case it is the case of the workman herself that she was appointed on 7-7-87 and her services were terminated on 15-1-88, which means that the workman had not worked for 240 days prior to the date of termination of her services. This being the case, the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the Act were not applicable to her, and hence it cannot be held that there is violation of the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act on the part of the employer. In the circumstances, I hold that the workman has failed to prove that the employer terminated her services in violation of the provisions of the I. D. Act, 1947 and hence I answer the issue No. 1 in the negative.

7. ISSUE No. 2: The contention of the workman is that the employer terminated her services w. e. f. 15-1-1988 illegally and without any justification. Adv. Mane representing the workman submitted that no letter of termination was issued to the workman by the employer, terminating her services w. e. f. 15-1-1988, and therefore action on the part of the employer is illegal. He further submitted that no conditions for terminating the services of the workman have been laid down in the letter of appointment, and also no notice of termination was given to the workman nor wages in lieu of notice was paid to her as also no compensation as required under Sec. 25 F was paid to her, and hence the termination of the services of the workman is illegal. Adv. Gaitonde representing the employer on the other hand has argued that the workman was appointed on daily wages for 25 days and on completion of 25 days, her services automatically came to an end. He submitted that the services of the workman were never terminated on 15-1-88 and therefore there was no question of issuing letter of termination to the workman, or giving her notice, or notice or any compensation.

In the present case, only the workman has led evidence by examining herself. The employer has not led any evidence. Since it is the contention of the workman that employer terminated her services illegally, and without justification on 15-1-88, the burden lay on her to prove the same. There is absolutely no evidence from the workman that her services were terminated by the employer on 15-1-88. On the contrary the workman in her deposition stated that she joined the services on 7-7-87 and continued to be in employment till 31-1-88, which means that her services were not terminated on 15-1-88 as contended by her in her pleadings. In her deposition, she never stated that, her services were terminated by the employer on 15-1-1988. In her cross examination, at the instance of the employer, she produced the letter of appointment dated 7-7-87 Exb. E-1. This letter of appointment shows that the workman was appointed as Steno typist on daily wages for 25 days from 7-7-87. In cross examination, the workman stated that even after the expiry of 25 days from 7-7-87 she continued to be in service as fresh letters of appointment were issued to her from time to time. The employer denied that any such fresh letters were issued to her. However, the workman did not produce the said fresh letter of appointment to support her contention that she continued to work even after the expiry of 25 days from 7-7-87. In the circumstances, I hold that the workman has failed to prove that her services were terminated by the employer on 15-1-88 and that the said termination is illegal and unjustified. On the contrary the letter dated 7-7-87 Exb. E-1 supports the case of the employer that the workman was appointed temporarily for 25 days from 7-7-87 and her services came to an end on the expiry of the said period of 25 days. In the circumstances, I hold that the workman has failed to prove that her services were terminated by the employer on 15-1-88 and that the said termination is illegal and unjustified. Hence, I answer the issue No. 2 in the Negative.

8. ISSUE No. 3: The workman has claimed for regularisation of her services w. e. f. the date of her initial appointment that is from 7-7-87.

From the pleadings made by the workman in her statement of claim and the evidence that has been led by her it appears that the claim of the workman for regularisation of her services is based only on the ground that she worked as Steno typist with the employer for some time prior to her appointment as junior Steno typist on a probationary period of 2 years vide order dated 24-9-93. In fact no evidence has been brought on record by the workman to substantiate her claim for regularisation. In the present case the evidence on record shows that the workman was initially appointed on 7-7-87 for a period of 25 days vide letter of appointment dated 7-7-87 Exb. E-1. Though the workman stated in her deposition that she continued to work even after the expiry of the period of 25 days, and that fresh letters of appointment were issued to her from time to time, there is absolutely no evidence to that effect. The workman herself has stated in her deposition that after the termination of her services on 31-1-88, no person was appointed in her place till the post of Steno typist was created, and she was appointed to that post w. e. f., 30-8-93 vide order dated 5-10-93 Exb. E-2. The Supreme Court in the case of State of Haryana and Others v/s Piara Singh reported in for 1992 SC 2130, has held that the court must, while giving direction for regularisation of services, act with due care and caution. It must first ascertain the relevant facts and must be cognizant of the several situations and eventualities that may arise on account of such directions. The Supreme Court further held that a pragmatic and practical view has to be taken, in as much as every such direction not only tells upon the public exchequer but also has the effect of increasing the cadre strength of a particular service, class or category. The Supreme Court in the case of Delhi Development Horticulture Employees' Union v/s Delhi Administration reported in AIR 1992 SC 789 in para 15 of its judgment has observed that the judicial trend is that the workmen who have completed 240 or more days of service are directed to be regularised. This implies that in order that a person can claim regularisation, he should have put in minimum 240 days of service. In the present case I have already held that the workman was in continuous employment for one year prior to the termination of her service. There is absolutely no evidence that the workman has put in service of 240 days or more. The evidence on record shows that the workman was employed initially for a short specific period, i. e. for 25 days and there is no evidence to show that the workman continued to work for the employer even after the expiry of the said initial period of 25 days. This being the case, merely because the workman earlier worked for the employer for some period, the same would not make the workman entitled for regularisation. The workman has totally failed to make out a case for regularisation of her service w. e. f. 7-7-1987. In the circumstances, I hold that the demand of the workman for regularisation of her services w. e. f. 7-7-87 is not legal and justified. Hence, I answer the issue No. 3 in the negative.

9. ISSUE No. 4: This issue pertains to whether the workman is entitled to any relief. The contention of the workman was that the employer terminated her services w. e. f. 15-1-88 illegally and in violation of the provisions of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947. The workman's contention also was that she is entitled to regularisation of her services w. e. f. 7-7-1987. I have already held that the workman has failed to prove that the employer terminated her services w. e. f. 15-1-88 or that it was in violation of Sec. 25 F of the I. D. Act, 1947. I have also held that the workman has failed to prove that her demand for regularisation of her services is legal and justified. This being the case the workman is not entitled to any relief, and hence I hold it accordingly and answer the issue No. 4 in the negative.

In the circumstances, I pass the following order.

ORDER

It is hereby held that the employer, Mapusa Municipal Council did not terminate the services of the workman Miss Elita Ferrao with effect from 15-1-1988 but she ceased to be in employment on the expiry of 25 days

from 7-7-1987, as per the letter of appointment dated 7-7-1987. It is hereby further held that the demand of the workman Miss Elita Ferrao for regularisation in the post of Jr. Stenographer/typist w. e. f. 7th July, 1987 is not legal and justified. It is further held that the workman Miss Elita Ferrao is not entitled to any relief.

There shall be no order as to costs. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Ajit J. Agni)
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. MISC/Award/96-LAB

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

J. M. de Almeida, Jt. Secretary (Labour).

Panaji, 25th June, 1996.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Ajit J. Agni, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

No. IT/48/85

Workmen Rep. by
Goa Trade & Commercial Workers Union,
Panaji-Goa.

— Workmen/Party I

V/s

M/s Pimenta Cement Products,
Margao-Goa

— Employer/ Party II

Workmen/Party I — Represented by Shri Subhas Naik.

Employer/Party II — Represented by Adv. B. G. Kamat.

Panaji, dated: 13-5-1996.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) the Government of Goa by order dated 17th October, 1985 bearing No. 28/39/85-ILD, referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

"Whether the demands of the Goa Trade & Commercial Workers the demands of the Goa Trade & Commercial Workers' Union contained in annexure "A" raised before the employer, M/s Pimenta Cement Products, Fatorda, Margao, Salcete-Goa, on 1-2-1985 are justified ?

if not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to ?"

The reference contained as many as 16 (sixteen) demands raised by the Union, namely for (1) Pay scales and Grades (2) Fitment (3) Seniority-increment (4) Fixed Dearness allowance (5) Travelling allowance (6) Canteen allowance (7) Washing allowance (8) Attendance bonus (9) Leave facilities (10) Overtime-Payments (11) Payment of Wages and Advances (12) Uniforms (13) Appointment letters/Pay-slips/Confirmation letters (14) Rest-Rooms (15) Lockers and (16) First Aid Box.

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. IT 48/85 and registered A/D notice was issued to the parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the parties put in their appearance. The Party I (for short, "Union") filed its statement of claim. The facts of case in brief as pleaded by the Union are that the Party II (for Short, "Employer") is engaged in the business of manufacturing cement grills, cement poles, water tanks, benches, sinks, dustbins, etc., in its factory situated at Murida, Fatorda, Margao-Goa, since the year 1976. That the products manufactured by the employer have great demand and the factory of the employer has been running to maximum capacity. That the Union by letter dated 1-2-1985 submitted the charter of demands to the employer. The employer adopted a negative attitude and did not discuss with the Union on the said demands. That thereafter the union approached the Labour Commissioner who held the conciliation proceedings, but the same resulted into failure because of the negative attitude taken by the employer. The Union contended that taking into account the high cost of living in Goa and the prevailing wage and service conditions, the demands raised by the Union are just and reasonable.

3. The employer filed the written statement denying the claim of the Union. The employer denied that the Union had locus standi to raise the demands on behalf of the workmen of the employer. The employer denied that the products manufactured by it had great demand or that its factory was running to maximum capacity or that the employer was making good profit out of its business. The employer further denied that the demands raised by the Union are just and reasonable. The employer stated that the demands raised by the Union were exorbitant and unrealistic, and in case demands are allowed, the employer would not be able to bear the additional burden. The Union thereafter filed the rejoinder controverting the pleadings made by the employer in the written statement.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed and subsequently evidence was also recorded. However, during the pendency of the case, the Union filed an application dated 24-4-96 stating that the workmen were not interested in proceeding further with their demands and the dispute be disposed off as settled between the parties and consequently no dispute award be passed. The employer did not object to the application of the Union. Since the Union itself has stated in the application that the workmen are not interested in the pursuing of their demands further and there is no dispute with the employer as regards the charter of demands, the reference does not survive.

In the circumstances, I pass the following order.

ORDER

It is hereby held that the reference does not survive since the dispute between the workmen represented by Goa Trade & Commercial

Workers' Union and the Management of M/s Pimenta Cement Products, Fatorda, Margao-Goa, does not exist.

No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(AJIT J. AGNI)
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

NOTIFICATIONS BY THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE APPELLATE SIDE, BOMBAY

No. A 1201/G/96

The Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges are pleased to make posting of following Additional District and Assistant Sessions Judge appointed under Government Order, Law Department, Estt., Government of Goa, Panaji No. 2-5-1-93/LD dated 5-1-1996.

Name of the newly appointed
Additional District Judge.

— Place of postings

Shri Afonso Araujo.
Additional District Judge &
Assistant Sessions Judge.

— Margao (South Goa)

High Court, Appellate Side,
Bombay, 24th June, 1996.

B. B. VARALE
Registrar

No. A 1201/G/96

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 9 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (No. 2 of 1974) the Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges appoint Shri Afonso Araujo, Additional District Judge and Assistant Sessions Judge to exercise jurisdiction in the Sessions Division of South Goa, Margao, in the State of Goa.

High Court, Appellate Side,
Bombay, 24th June, 1996.

B. B. VARALE
Registrar

Department of Revenue

Notification

No. 22/88/96-RD

Whereas it appears to the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed

for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for MLA's hostel and approach road for Legislative Assembly Complex at Porvorim.

And whereas in the opinion of the Government the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") are applicable.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby notifies under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

The Government further directs under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act that the provisions of section 5A of the said Act shall not apply in respect of the said land.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contract for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed under paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of section 24 of the said Act be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette and in two daily newspapers and public notice thereof shall be given in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part the fact will also be notified in the same manner.

4. The Government further appoints under clause (c) of section 3 of the said Act Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector, North Goa District, Panaji under the said Act in respect the said land.

5. The Government also authorises under sub-section (2) of section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector, North Goa District, Panaji.
2. Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Panaji.
3. Assistant Accounts Officer, Goa Legislative Secretariat, Secretariat, Panaji.
4. The Director of Settlement & Land Records, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Panaji for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka : Bardez

Village : Penha de Franca

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Appx. area in sq. mts.
1	2	3

37/2 part O: Government of India.
Lalitabai Madhukar Parulekar.
Vidhyadar Madhukar Parulekar.
Mukund Mudhakar Parulekar.

325

1	2	3
37/5	part O: Ramnath Naik. Government of India.	525
" /6	" O: Comunidade. Legislature Department. Government of Goa. Government of India.	25
" /7	" O: St. Monica. Legislature Department. Government of Goa. Government of India.	375
38	O: Antonio Vieira Velho. Legislature Department. Government of Goa. Government of India.	5482
Boundaries:		
North: S. No. 37/2, Road.		
South: S. No. 37/7, 6.		
East: S. No. 37/2, 5, 6,		
West: S. No. 37/7, 5, Road.		
North: S. No. 35.		
South: S. No. 52.		
East: S. No. 38.		
West: S. No. 338.		
Total		6732

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Smt. A. Menezes, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 12th November, 1996.

Notification

No. 22/133/96-RD

Whereas it appears to the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as the "the Government") that the land specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for construction of Veterinary Dispensary and 'D' type Quarters at Shiroda.

And whereas in the opinion of the Government the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") are applicable.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby notifies under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

The Government further directs under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act that the provisions of section 5A of the said Act shall not apply in respect of the said land.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contract for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed under paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of section 24 of the said Act be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette and in two daily newspapers and public notice thereof shall be given in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part the fact will also be notified in the same manner.

4. The Government further appoints under clause (c) of section 3 of the said Act Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Ponda to perform the functions of a Collector, North Goa District, Panaji under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government also authorises under sub-section (2) of section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector, North Goa District, Panaji.
2. Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Ponda.
3. Director of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services, Panaji.
4. The Director of Settlement & Land Records, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Deputy Collector/S. D. O., Ponda for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka : Ponda		Village : Shiroda
Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Name of the person believed to be interested	Appx. area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
157/1	part O: Comunidade of Shiroda.	2040
Boundaries:		
North: Road.		
South: S. No. 157/2.		
East: S. No. 157/2.		
West: S. No. 157/1.		
Total		2040

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Smt. A. Menezes, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 12th November, 1996.

Notification

No. 22/97/96-RD

Whereas it appears to the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition at Dramapur in Salcete Taluka for setting up of an Industrial Estate by Goa, Daman & Diu Industrial Development Corporation, Panaji.

And whereas in the opinion of the Government the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act I of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") are applicable.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby notifies under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

The Government further directs under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act that the provisions of section 5A of the said Act shall not apply in respect of the said land.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contract for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed under paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of section 24 of the said Act be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette and in two daily newspapers and public notice thereof shall be given in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part the fact will also be notified in the same manner.

4. The Government further appoints under clause (c) of section 3 of the said Act Special Land Acquisition Officer, Industrial Development Corporation, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector, South Goa District, Margao under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government also authorises under sub-section (2) of section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector, South Goa District, Margao.
2. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Industrial Development Corporation, Midas Touch Bldg., Opp. El Dorado Theatre, Panaji.
3. The General Manager (LA), Industrial Development Corporation, Saraswati Mandir Bldg., Panaji.
4. The Director of Settlement & Land Records, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Industrial Development Corporation, Panaji for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka : Salcete		Village : Dramapur
Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Appx. area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
174/1	O: Manual Xavier Costa.	75
174/2	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes.	100
174/3	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Severina Barreto.	50
174/4	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes.	300
174/5	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Severina Barreto.	250
174/6	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes.	400
174/7	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Severina Barreto.	400
174/8	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes.	500
174/9	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Severina Barreto.	550
174/10	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes.	675
174/11	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Severina Barreto.	675
174/12	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: John Francisco Gomes. Maria Conceicao Furtado.	2100
174/13	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: (1) Maria Conceicao Furtado. (2) Rosario D'Silva.	2100
174/14	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Kistodio D'Silva.	4100
174/15	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Luizinha Rodrigues.	975
174/16	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Luizinha Rodrigues.	275
174/17	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Damaciana D'Silva.	1150
174/18	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Luizinha Rodrigues.	200
174/19	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Luizinha Rodrigues.	225

1	2	3	1	2	3
174/20	O: (Gilhermina Dias). Nagu Surya Naik Khandekar. T: Manuel Pereira.	1200	203	O: 1. Etelina Alfonso. 2. Maria Conceicao Soures.	29850
174/21	O: (Inez Dias). (Gilnerna Dias). Nagu Surya Naik Khandekar.	1400	204/1	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Josephina Carvellis.	5975
189/1	O: C. M. Bantee.	175	204/2	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Damacina Silva.	700
189/2	O: E. P. Gonsalves.	11175	204/3	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Etelvina Rafos.	175
189/3	O: Government of Goa (Town Planning).	1300	204/4	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Pascoal D'Silva.	7000
189/5	O: E. P. Gonsalves.	7800	204/5	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Carmelin S. Carneiro.	6750
190/1	O: E. P. Gonsalves.	11573	204/6	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Jose A. Silva.	6475
190/2	O: B. D. Barreto. Government of Goa.	650	204/7	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: 1. Belto Rodrigues. 2. Etelvina Rafos. 3. Mataldina Rodrigues.	8275
190/3	O: Government of Goa (Town Planning).	1475	204/8	O: Naguesh Porob Chimulkar.	2275
190/4	O: E. P. Gonsalves.	5825	204/9	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Efelin Rato.	725
190/5	O: 1. A. P. E. Gomes. 2. Rodolf Gomes. 3. R. L. Gomes. 4. J. S. Gomes. 5. Hilda T. V. Prazers Gomes. 6. Hilda P. R. P. Gomes. 7. Ana Beliza Paiva. 8. Maria M. P. Gomes. 9. Antonio R. D. Gomes. 10. Maria O. Barreto. 11. Antonio Oliveira Gomes. 12. Jessica Almeida. 13. Roldao M. Gomes. 14. Maria D. M. Dias. 15. Juliao Dos M. Gomes. 16. Maria E. Fernandes.	53689	204/10	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Damacina Silva.	650
193/1	O: Jose Rosario Costa.	32950	204/11	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Etelvina Rafos.	700
193/2	O: (Brut Costa). 1. M/s. Borkar Printers. 2. Busauraj V. Charate. 3. Arun alias Sidhalingappa. 4. Prakash Bachelto Mungarwadi. 5. Dilip R. Khansolkar. 6. Priyagi R. Naik. 7. Government of Goa. 8. K. M. Rajan. 9. Philip Lopes. 10. Santolin Lopes. 11. Shashi P. P. 12. Socorro Timotio Cardozo. 13. Shri K. S. S. Iyer.	24000	204/12	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Damacian Silva.	625
194	O: Jose R. Costa.	34260	204/13	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Etelvina Rafos.	650
195/2	O: C. M. Barreto	8875	204/14	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Domaciana Silva.	675
201	O: C. M. Barreto.	47175	204/15	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Etelvina Rafos.	750
			204/16	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Domacian Sliva.	600
			204/17	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Etelvina Rafos.	800
			204/18	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Domaciana Silva.	50
			204/19	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Domaciana Silva.	150
			204/20	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Inacin D'Costa.	1025

1	2	3	1	2	3
204/21	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Francisco D'Costa.	650	237/ 1	O: Comunidade of Dramapur.	725
236/1	O: Sebastiao Carneus.	3925	237/2	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	50
236/2	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benedito Piedade Rodrigues.	5875	237/3	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Bescina Rebello.	75
236/3	O: Counidade of Dramapur. T: Caitano Cardoso.	5250	237/4	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Sebastiao Fernandes.	2050
236/4	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Sabastiao Rodrigues.	2275	237/5	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Manvelina Fernandes.	2100
236/5	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Antoneta Piedade Rodrigues.	2425	237/6	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Sebastiao Fernandes.	1775
236/6	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Precioze Rodrigues.	1125	237/7	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Manuelina Ferrao.	1625
236/7	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benjamin D'Costa.	1125	237/8	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Xaventa Rodrigues.	8800
236/8	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Precioza Rodrigues.	1100	237/9	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Florina Seorep.	4250
236/9	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benjamin D'Costa.	1200	237/10	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	2550
236/10	O: Communitade of Dramapur. T: Precioze Rodrigues.	600	237/11	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	125
236/11	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benjamin D'Costa.	475	237/12	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	100
236/12	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Precioze Rodrigues.	200	237/13	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	75
236/13	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benjamin D'Costa.	150	237/14	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	100
236/14	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Precioze Rodrigues.	225	237/15	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	125
236/15	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Benjamin D'Costa.	200	237/16	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	50
236/16	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Jose Santano Miranda.	4475	237/17	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	75
236/17	O: Comunidade of Dramapur.	50	237/18	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	1325
236/18	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Manuel Costa.	3375	237/19	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	200
236/19	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Pasquela Costa.	6500	237/20	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	150
236/20	O: Communitade of Dramapur. T: Rock Miranda.	4500	237/21	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	200
236/21	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rock Miranda.	50	237/22	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	125
236/22	O: Elizabeth Afonso.	750			

1	2	3
237/23	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	50
237/24	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	325
237/25	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	50
237/26	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	550
237/27	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Euscina Rebello.	275
237/28	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Rita Maria Fernandes.	150
237/29	O: Comunidade of Dramapur. T: Erocina Rebello.	25
237/30	O: Govind Pai Raitukar.	3900
237/31	O: Govind M. Pai Raitukar.	8525
237/32	O: Elizabeth Alfonso.	600

Boundaries:

North : S. No. 185, Road, S. No. 187/1,
8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, S. No. 180, 176/1,
7, 191/2.

South : S. No. 243, 232/2, 1, Nala.

East : S. No. 238/5, 191/2, 4, Road & 192.

West : S. No. 176/2, 3, 4, 176/43, Nala,
173/1.

Total 421097

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Smt. A. Menezes, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 13th November, 1996.

-----♦♦♦-----

Department of Social Welfare

Order

No. 13/4/90-SWD

- Read:- 1. Order No. 13/4/90-SWD dated 28-5-1990.
2. Order No. 13/4/90-SWD dated 30-10-1990.
3. Order No. 13/4/90-SWD dated 25-10-1993.

In exercise of the powers under provisions of Clause 116 of the Articles of Association of Goa State Scheduled Castes and Other Backward Classes Finance and Development Corporation Limited, the Gov-

ernment of Goa is pleased to reconstitute the Board of Directors and to appoint the following persons as Directors of the Goa State Scheduled Castes and Other Backward Classes Finance and Development Corporation Limited with immediate effect:

1. Shri Luis Alex Cardoz, Minister for Forest. — Chairman
2. Shri Prakash Shankar Velip, M. L. A.
Saraswati Niwas, Hegde Dessai
Marg, Quepem. — Director
3. Shri Narayan B. Rao, Karaswada, Mapusa
Bardez-Goa. — do —
4. Shri Narendra N. Parsekar, C/o Laxman D.
Parsekar, Bairo Alto Wadda, Assagao,
Bardez-Goa. — do —
5. Shri Santosh S. Parsekar, Madhlamaz,
Mandrem. — do —
6. Shri Kashinath Kuttikar, Nagali, Taleigao-
Ilhas-Goa. — do —
7. Shri Vithu Vargaokar, Carambolim, Ilhas-Goa. — do —
8. Shri Sunil Varak, Bhuipal, Honda-Satari. — do —
9. Representative of Lead Bank viz. State Bank
of India, Panaji. — do —
10. The Managing Director, Goa State Scheduled
Caste and Other Backward Classes Finance
and Development Corporation Limited, Panaji-
Goa. — do —
11. Director of Social Welfare, Panaji-Goa. — do —
12. Director of Industries Panaji. — do —

2. The tenure of the Directors will be for a period of three years.

3. The non-official Directors shall be entitled for sitting allowance at the rate of Rs. 100/- plus the actual travelling allowances..

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

G. J. Prabhudessai, Under Secretary (Social Welfare).

Panaji, 14th November, 1996.